United Nations A/ES-10/85 S/2001/486

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
15 May 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Tenth emergency special session
Agenda item 5
Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Today, the Palestinian people solemnly commemorated the day of *Al-Nakba*, marking the date 53 years ago when the Palestinian people were dispossessed and uprooted from their homeland in 1948 amidst massacres, destruction and devastation of war. Demonstrations were held today, which included the observance by the Palestinian people of three minutes of mournful silence, throughout Palestinian villages, towns, cities and refugee camps in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem.

Today, the Israeli occupying forces also continued to pursue the bloody military campaign that has been waged against the Palestinian people since 28 September 2000. Following a typical and recurrent pattern, the Israeli occupying forces confronted Palestinian demonstrators with a disproportionate and excessive use of force, including live ammunition, rubber bullets and the use of snipers. These violent actions by the occupying forces resulted in the killing of 4 Palestinians and the wounding of more than 130 people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem. Furthermore, in addition to the barbaric executions committed yesterday by the Israeli occupying forces, of which we informed you in our letter of 14 May 2001 (A/ES-10/84-S/2001/479), two more Palestinians were killed by the occupying forces yesterday in Gaza.

In follow-up to my previous letters to you on this grave matter, dated from 29 September 2000 to 14 May 2001 (A/55/432-S/2000/921; A/55/437-S/2000/930; A/55/450-S/2000/957; A/55/466-S/2000/971; A/55/474-S/2000/984; A/55/490-S/2000/993; A/ES-10/39-S/2000/1015; A/ES-10/40-S/2000/1025; A/ES-10/42-S/2000/1068; A/ES-10/43-S/2000/1078; A/ES-10/44-S/2000/1093; A/ES-10/45-S/2000/1104; A/ES-10/46-S/2000/1107; A/ES-10/47-S/2000/1116; A/ES-10/48-S/2000/1129; A/ES-10/49-S/2000/1154; A/ES-10/50-S/2000/1173; A/ES-10/51-S/2000/1185; A/ES-10/52-S/2000/1206; A/ES-10/53-S/2000/1247; A/ES-10/54-S/2001/7; A/ES-10/55-S/2001/33; A/ES-10/56-S/2001/50; A/ES-10/57-S/2001/101;

01-37374 (E) 150501

A/ES-10/58-S/2001/131; A/ES-10/59-S/2001/156; A/ES-10/60-S/2001/175; A/ES-10/61-S/2001/189; A/ES-10/64-S/2001/209; A/ES-10/65-S/2001/226; A/ES-10/66-S/2001/239; A/ES-10/67-S/2001/255; A/ES-10/68-S/2001/284; A/ES-10/69-S/2001/295; A/ES-10/70-S/2001/304; A/ES-10/71-S/2001/314; A/ES-10/72-S/2001/332; A/ES-10/75-S/2001/352; A/ES-10/76-S/2001/372; A/ES-10/79-S/2001/418; A/ES-10/80-S/2001/432; A/ES-10/81-S/2001/447; A/ES-10/82-S/2001/463; A/ES-10/83-S/2001/471; and A/ES-10/84-S/2001/479), it is my deep regret to inform you that since my letter to you yesterday, a total of six more Palestinians were killed by the Israeli occupying forces. (The names of the martyrs are contained in the annex to the present letter.) These killings bring the total number of Palestinian martyrs since 28 September 2000 to 461 people. Further, as evidenced by today's tragic events, the number of Palestinians injured as a direct result of actions of the occupying forces also continues to rise.

It is inconceivable that the international community can continue to stand by idly while daily military assaults, human rights violations and war crimes continue to be perpetrated by the Israeli occupying forces against the Palestinian people living under occupation. Rather, the international community must take urgent measures to bring an end to this bloody Israeli military campaign and to provide protection to the Palestinian civilians. This must begin with necessary and immediate action by the Security Council, which has been long overdue.

I would be grateful if you would arrange to have the text of the present letter and its annex distributed as a document of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 5, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Dr. Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations

Annex to the identical letters dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Names of martyrs killed by Israeli occupying forces in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem*

(Monday, 14 May 2001 to Tuesday, 15 May 2001)

Monday, 14 May 2001 (in addition to the 5 martyrs included in the letter of 14 May 2001)

1. Mohammed Yussef Al Qassas
2. Arafat Talal Abu Kuweik

Tuesday, 15 May 2001

1. Abdel Hakim Al Mana'amah
2. Mohammed Jihad Abu Jaser (17 years old)
3. Abdel Jawad Shehadah
4. Burhan Al Shakhsheer

* Total number of Palestinian martyrs killed by Israeli occupying forces since 28 September 2000 equals 461.

United Nations S/2001/487

Security Council

Distr.: General
16 May 2001

Original: English

Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the deputy and alternate representatives of Colombia on the Security Council

Pursuant to rule 15 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the Secretary-General wishes to report that he has received a note verbale dated 9 May 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations, stating that Mr. Nicolás Rivas has been appointed deputy representative of Colombia on the Security Council and Ms. Alma Viviana Pérez alternate representative.

In the opinion of the Secretary-General, this communication constitutes adequate provisional credentials.

01-37469 (E) 160501

United Nations S/2001/488

Security Council

Distr.: General
16 May 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 16 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

In my capacity as President of the Group of Arab States for the month of May 2001, I have the honour to convey to you the official request of the members of the Group for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to discuss the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, concerning the continuous escalation of repressive practices against the Palestinian population by Israel, the occupying Power, in addition to its policy of premeditated assassinations.

(*Signed*) Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations

01-37505 (E) 160501 160501

United Nations A/56/75 S/2001/489

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session
Item 30 of the preliminary list*
Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 16 May 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On 1 May 2001, a letter from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations and the annexes thereto, containing a letter signed by Naira Melkounian, so-called Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nagorny Karabakh, and a "memorandum" were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and the Security Council (A/56/64-S/2001/431).

In this connection I have the honour to state the following:

1. No country of "Nagorny Karabakh", referred to in the foregoing letter, exists in the world. There is the Nagorny Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan that, as a result of military aggression by the Republic of Armenia against my country, is under its occupation.

2. In its resolutions 822 (1993), 853 (1993), 874 (1993) and 884 (1993), the Security Council unequivocally reaffirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan and reconfirmed particularly that the Nagorny Karabakh region was an integral part of Azerbaijan.

3. Moreover, Armenia itself accepted and recognized the fact that the Nagorny Karabakh region is a part of the Republic of Azerbaijan, having unconditionally joined the consensus in adopting, for instance, General Assembly resolution 49/13 (1994) entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe", paragraph 8 of which read as follows:

* A/56/50.

01-37691 (E) 180501

"The General Assembly fully supports the activities of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe aimed at achieving a peaceful solution to the conflict in and around the Nagorny Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan and to alleviate the tension between the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan, and welcomes cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference in this regard."

4. As to the designation Nagorny Karabakh, it is, first of all, a place name in the Russian language, and secondly, a purely geographical concept: it exclusively designates the highland portion of the Greater Karabakh, a big region of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

5. The Government of my country categorically rejects any attempt to disseminate within the United Nations the notion of Nagorny Karabakh as an independent entity. Given the aforementioned resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Government is certain that the United Nations Secretariat will not allow the designation to be misused.

6. The circulation of the above-mentioned letter of highly dubious contents from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations as a document of the United Nations is blatant testimony of Armenia's direct participation and involvement in the conflict as the main party thereto and of its aggressive and annexationist plans towards Azerbaijan.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 30 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Eldar **Kouliev**
Permanent Representative

United Nations A/55/943–S/2001/490

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda items 40, 41, 85 and 98

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

The situation in the Middle East

Question of Palestine

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources

Letter dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of resolution 115/6053, entitled "Question of Jerusalem", which was adopted by the Council of the League of Arab States meeting at its one hundred and fifteenth regular session at the level of ministers for foreign affairs, held at the seat of the League's secretariat in Cairo on 12 March 2001.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 40, 41, 85 and 98, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer

01-37745 (E) 210501 210501

Annex to the letter dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Question of Jerusalem

The Council of the League of Arab States,

Having considered:

The note by the Secretariat;

The recommendation adopted by the Arab Conference of Officials in Charge of Palestinian Affairs in the Host Countries at its sixty-fifth session;

The relevant resolutions of the Summit Conferences and of the United Nations;

Its previous resolutions on the same subject;

And the recommendation of the Political Affairs Committee,

Noting with concern the deteriorating situation in the city of Jerusalem caused by ongoing Israeli practices aimed at its Judaization and at the expulsion of its Palestinian residents and the seizure of their property and resulting from the expansion of existing settlements and the repeated imposition of closures,

Decides:

1. To affirm Palestinian sovereignty over East Jerusalem and the importance of the city both as the capital of the State of Palestine and in order to ensure geographical contiguity and the freedom of movement and of economic activity of the Palestinian people;

2. To affirm the Arab character of Jerusalem and of its antiquities and Holy Places, and in particular the status of the Buraq Wall (Western Wall) as an Islamic, Palestinian and Arab monument; and to confirm the December 1930 findings of the Commission appointed by the British Government, with the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, concerning the Arab right to the Western or Wailing Wall [A/7057/Add.1-S/8427/Add.1];

3. To hold Israel responsible for any danger to the Buraq Wall, of any kind whatever, arising out of any threatened assaults upon it by the Israeli authorities or by Jewish extremists;

4. To affirm the established Arab position concerning the illegal character of moves to relocate the embassy of the United States of America to Jerusalem; and to recall the resolution adopted by the Eleventh Arab Summit Conference, held in Amman in 1980, concerning the severance of relations with countries that relocate their embassies to Jerusalem or recognize the city as the capital of Israel;

5. To urge the international community to bring pressure to bear on Israel to halt all of its illegal practices and measures in Jerusalem, which are in violation of all the relevant international covenants and conventions, and to do so in particular in

relation to settlement activities, the expropriation of land, excavations, the withdrawal of identity documents and the imposition of blockades;

6. To call upon humanitarian and human rights organizations to support the litigation seeking to establish that the leasing by the United States of America of the land on which it intends to build its embassy is illegal;

7. To intensify efforts with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to give effect to Executive Board decision 159 EX/3.4.1, relating to Jerusalem, and to General Conference resolution 30 C/28 in order to ensure the completion of the mission entrusted to the American expert Oleg Graber, who, in accordance with the spirit of the 1972 Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, was commissioned to prepare a report on the cultural heritage of Jerusalem;

8. To appeal to the United Nations and its specialized agencies as well as to other international and regional organizations to refrain from participating in conferences held in Jerusalem as long as the city is occupied and no agreement in its regard has been reached;

9. To request the Secretariat to intensify its consultations with all the members of the Security Council and with other States in order to explain the issue of Jerusalem, affirm the Arab position in its regard and state that position at international conferences and in international forums and to strive for compliance with the resolutions that embody international legitimacy, specifically Security Council resolution 242 (1967), in which the Council emphasizes the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and resolution 252 (1968), in which it considers Israeli measures for the Judaization of the city of Jerusalem to be illegal;

10. To take the necessary measures to have the Al-Aqsa Fund play a more active role in funding projects for the preservation of the Arab and Islamic identity of Jerusalem and for enabling the Palestinian economy to develop its indigenous capacities, disengage from the Israeli economy and cope with the policy of isolation and blockade.

Resolution 6053
One hundred and fifteenth regular session
2nd meeting
12 March 2001

United Nations A/55/944 S/2001/491

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda items 40, 41 and 85
The situation in the Middle East

Question of Palestine

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of resolution 115/6057, entitled "Dubious attempts by Israel to have a number of archaeological sites in East Jerusalem inscribed on the World Heritage List", which was adopted by the Council of the League of Arab States meeting at its one hundred and fifteenth regular session at the level of ministers for foreign affairs, held at the seat of the League's secretariat in Cairo on 12 March 2001.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 40, 41 and 85, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer

01-37710 (E) 210501 210501

Annex to the letter dated 15 May 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Dubious attempts by Israel to have a number of archaeological sites in East Jerusalem inscribed on the World Heritage List

The Council of the League of Arab States,

Having considered:

The note dated 5 February 2001 from the Permanent Mission of the State of Palestine;

The note by the Secretariat;

And the recommendation of the Political Affairs Committee,

Decides:

1. To condemn Israel's dubious attempts to assert its sovereignty over Jerusalem and certain areas of the West Bank by seeking to have a number of archaeological sites in Jerusalem and the occupied Palestinian territories inscribed on the World Heritage List;

2. To have member States establish the necessary contacts, at the ministerial level, with the States members of the World Heritage Committee in order to convey to them the Arab position that Jerusalem and the occupied Palestinian territories have since 1967 constituted occupied territory under the terms of resolutions that have the force of international law and the resolutions of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and to have member States make the necessary endeavours for the deferral of any action on the Israeli request to the World Heritage Committee;

3. To request the Secretary-General, as a matter of urgency, to form a committee of experts on legal matters and on matters relating to Jerusalem, open to representatives of all member States and meeting at League headquarters, to consider the question of the Israeli endeavours to have a number of archaeological sites in Jerusalem and the occupied Palestinian territories inscribed on the World Heritage List and to submit a report to the Council at its next session;

4. To request the Secretary-General, acting in coordination with the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, to hold consultations with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and to report to the Council at its next session.

Resolution 6057
One hundred and fifteenth regular session
2nd meeting
12 March 2001

United Nations S/2001/492

Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 10 May 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to resolution 1171 (1998), adopted by the Security Council on 5 June 1998, concerning Sierra Leone. In paragraph 4 of the resolution, the Committee is required to report to the Council on notifications received from States on the export of arms and related materiel to Sierra Leone, as well as on notification of imports of arms and related materiel made by the Government of Sierra Leone.

Accordingly, I wish to inform you that the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone received a notification on 9 May 2001 from the Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, of the import of the following arms and related materiel for use by the Sierra Leone Army:

- 14 April 2001 — 1,500 Self-loading rifles (7.62 mm)
- 30 April 2001 — 792 Self-loading rifles (7.62 mm)

(*Signed*) Anwarul Karim **Chowdhury**
Chairman
Security Council Committee established pursuant
to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone

01-37601 (E) 170501

United Nations S/2001/492*

Security Council

Distr.: General
25 May 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 10 May 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to resolution 1171 (1998), adopted by the Security Council on 5 June 1998, concerning Sierra Leone. In paragraph 4 of the resolution, the Committee is required to report to the Council on notifications received from States on the export of arms and related materiel to Sierra Leone, as well as on notification of imports of arms and related materiel made by the Government of Sierra Leone.

Accordingly, I wish to inform you that the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone received a notification on 9 May 2001 from the Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, of the import of the following arms and related materiel for use by the Sierra Leone Army:

14 May 2001	1,500 self-loading rifles (7.62 mm)
30 May 2001	792 self-loading rifles (7.62 mm)

(*Signed*) Anwarul Karim **Chowdhury**
Chairman
Security Council Committee established pursuant
to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone

* Reissued for technical reasons.

01-37601* (E) 250501

United Nations S/2001/493

Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 10 May 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to resolution 1171 (1998), adopted by the Security Council on 5 June 1998, concerning Sierra Leone. In paragraph 4 of the resolution, the Committee is required to report to the Council on notifications received from States on the export of arms and related materiel to Sierra Leone, as well as on notifications of imports of arms and related materiel made by the Government of Sierra Leone.

Accordingly, I wish to inform you that the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone received a notification on 3 May 2001 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, with regard to the export of the following military equipment for use by the Nigerian contingent of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL):

- 496 fragmentation jackets

The jackets were shipped to Lagos on 25 April 2001, and will be airlifted from Nigeria to Lungi International Airport, Freetown, in due course.

(*Signed*) Anwarul Karim **Chowdhury**
Chairman
Security Council Committee established
pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997)
concerning Sierra Leone

01-37625 (E) 170501

United Nations S/2001/494

Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 17 May 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

In my capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Group at the United Nations, I have the honour to request the convening of an immediate meeting of the Security Council to examine the grave and deteriorating situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem, resulting from the continuous escalation of repressive practices by Israel, the occupying Power, against the Palestinian people.

(*Signed*) **Zainuddin** Yahya
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-37631 (E) 170501

United Nations S/2001/495

Security Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 17 May 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of a detailed report on the delay in the construction of the Light-Water Reactor (LWR) Project under the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States of America Agreed Framework, released by the Korean Central News Agency on 16 May 2001 (Juche 90) (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) **Li** Hyong Chol
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-37673 (E) 180501

Annex to the letter dated 17 May 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Detailed report on the delay in the construction of the light-water reactor (LWR) project under the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States of America Agreed Framework

Pyongyang, 16 May 2001 (Juche 90)

The Korean Central News Agency releases, upon authorization, the following detailed report on the considerable delay in the construction of the LWR project under the DPRK-U.S. Agreed Framework.

1

The Agreed Framework, adopted on October 21, 1994 is a binding legal document in which the two governments are committed to resolve "nuclear issue", remove mistrust and build confidence between the two countries and move towards improved relations between the two nations.

The central point of the framework is the DPRK pledge on nuclear freeze versus the U.S. pledge on the provision of light water reactors.

The agreed framework specifies as follows:

"In accordance with the October 20, 1994 letter of assurance from the U.S. President, the U.S. will undertake to make arrangements for the provision to the DPRK of a LWR project with a total generating capacity of approximately 2,000 megawatts electric (mw(e)) by a target date of 2003. ...

Upon receipt of U.S. assurances for the provision of LWRs and for arrangements for interim energy alternatives, the DPRK will freeze its graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities and will eventually dismantle these reactors and related facilities."

The U.S. commitment under the agreed framework on provision of light water reactor power plants with a generating capacity of 2,000mw(e) by the year 2003 was based on the DPRK freezing of graphite-moderated reactors under construction and giving up of a new project on power plants.

At the time, we were about to complete the construction of graphite-moderated reactors with a generating capacity of 50mw(e) and 200mw(e) each,

relying on local raw materials, technology and natural resources. At the same time, we were proceeding with the plan to construct atomic power plants with a generating capacity of several hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of electricity a year starting from 1997 in an effort to ensure production of 2,000mw(e) annually by the year 2003.

The 7th session of the 9th Supreme People's Assembly held in April 1994 adopted a decision to finish off the atomic power plants under construction as early as possible and embark on a new power plant project with reinforced efforts in order to solve the acute shortage of electricity in the country.

An inevitable historical background made us proceed with graphite-moderated reactor project.

The former Soviet Union was reluctant to offer us a LWR, while offering supplies to her satellite states, for the reason that we did not join the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON).

We then tried to purchase it from western countries such as Canada but ended up with empty hands due to political reasons.

We determined to live our own way and made public the policy on building nuclear power industry suited to the actual conditions of our country and embarked on developing our own technology related to the nuclear power industry relying on uranium and graphite easily available in the DPRK.

After long-drawn strenuous efforts, we developed a technology of graphite-moderated reactor and succeeded in building one.

However, the U.S. began to spread the "nuclear suspicion" on our graphite-moderated reactor and eventually came up with creating "nuclear crisis."

This was how the DPRK-U.S. bilateral talks on "nuclear issue" came to take place and they were driven into stalemate due to the hostility and mistrust that existed between the two nations for such a long time.

It was against this backdrop that in June 1994 President Kim Il Sung gave audience to the visiting former U.S. President Jimmy Carter.

At the meeting, the President told Carter that the outbreak of the issue on "nuclear suspicion" was grounded in the misunderstanding and distrust between the DPRK and the U.S. He also told him that resolution of this issue depended entirely on how much confidence the U.S. had in the DPRK and that the U.S. provision of LWR would clear away misunderstanding and distrust between the two nations.

Mr. Carter indicated the U.S. willingness to supply LWRs to the DPRK.

This led to the conclusion of the agreed framework at the DPRK-U.S. bilateral talks with major emphasis on the DPRK nuclear freeze versus the U.S. supply of LWRs defusing the crisis thereafter.

Both the DPRK and the U.S. had expected that the freeze on the graphite-moderated reactors and their related facilities would address the U.S. security concerns, while the U.S. LWR supply would help remove the DPRK mistrust of the U.S. and promote confidence-building between the two nations.

To that end, we entered into complete freeze on the graphite-moderated reactors and their related facilities within one-month period as is spelled out in the agreed framework, and allowed the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to monitor the freeze, while rendering full cooperation to the agency.

In addition, we completed the safe storage of spent-fuel rods out of 5mw(e) experimental atomic reactor as obligated under the agreed framework.

After all, we have lived up to our obligation under the agreed framework over 100 percent.

But, the construction of LWR power plants the U.S. pledged to complete by the year 2003, witnesses too much delay making it difficult to expect its completion.

When we look back on the LWR project during the past seven years since the birth of the agreed framework, only the ground-breaking ceremony took place as late as in august 1997 and the site preparation scheduled to be finished in 14 months has been made about 95 percent, while ground work is yet to begin.

It is not accidental that some speculate the completion of LWR project as hardly possible by the year 2008 and may be feasible only by the year 2010.

Now that the LWR project is unlikely to be completed by the year 2003, the implementation of the agreed framework has reached a serious pass.

2

In the light of the level of the present DPRK-U.S. relations and the unique nature of the agreed framework, the delay in the LWR project may lead to the scrapping of the agreed framework itself.

The very nature of the DPRK-U.S. relations, based on hostility, not on confidence, resulted in the stipulation of the DPRK nuclear freeze and the U.S. LWR provision as simultaneous actions in the agreed framework.

The failure by the U.S. to live up to its obligation to LWR project by the year 2003 would possibly drive us to respond to it with abandoning on-going nuclear freeze.

We cannot sit idle over our loss while maintaining the nuclear freeze.

Many years have passed since the adoption of the DPRK-U.S. agreed framework, yet the DPRK-U.S. relations are still characterized by distrust and misunderstandings and they have grown stronger since the emergence of the new administration in the U.S.

One can recall that the DPRK-U.S. agreed framework was made possible owing to the courageous decision made by our side to sacrifice our self-reliant nuclear power industry.

We made such political concession out of the good faith to help remove the U.S. concerns on "suspicion about nuclear-weapons development" and build confidence between the two nations.

However, when we trace back the process of delay in the construction of the LWR project by the U.S., we emerge with increased suspicion on the U.S. intention as to whether the U.S. is truly committed to the supply of LWRs or seeking some kind of filthy political purposes.

Since the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) aimed at supplying LWRs to the DPRK was organized on March 9, 1995, the U.S. has delayed its process by far citing internal reasons such as fund sharing and so on.

Worse still, the U.S. deliberately delayed the process of the project raising such political issues as "missile issue" and "suspicion of underground nuclear facilities" which had nothing to do with the LWR project.

The responsibility for the delay in the supply of LWRs entirely rests with the U.S. side, the direct party to the Agreed Framework.

It would be a mistake for the U.S. if it tries to evade the responsibility for the delay in the LWR project for the reason that KEDO undertakes the project.

The agreed framework specifies as follows:

"The U.S. will organize under its leadership an international consortium to finance and supply the LWR project to be provided to the DPRK. The U.S., representing the international consortium, will serve as the principal point of contact with the DPRK for the LWR project."

Under the agreed framework, the U.S. side was authorized to organize an international consortium so as to secure fund and equipment for the construction of LWRs and the U.S., representing the international consortium, is entirely responsible for the completion of the LWR project.

On December 14, 1995 the U.S. side also signed the Supply Agreement which specifies that the U.S., as the principal contact point with the DPRK, is to provide LWRs to the DPRK on loan and turnkey basis.

The only thing we are expected to do is to receive the key upon its completion.

The U.S. President wrote as following in his letter of assurance dated October 20, 1994:

"In the event that this reactor project is not completed for the reasons beyond the control of the DPRK, I will use the full powers of my office to provide, to the extent necessary, such a project from the United States, subject to the U.S. congress."

The U.S. administration should have taken other steps earlier in order to meet the date of completion in the year 2003 true to the assurance made by the President.

Nonetheless, we see no steps taken by the U.S. administration in the efforts thus far.

What the U.S. side should do at this point is to come up with steps to cover the loss of 2,000mw(e) we are to suffer from the year 2003 due to the delay in the LWR construction.

It would be a misunderstanding if the U.S. thinks it covers the entire loss caused by the delay in the LWR project by delivering 500,000 metric tons (mts) of heavy fuel oil (HFO) annually at present.

Under the agreed framework, the U.S. delivery of the 500,000 mts of HFO pending the completion of the first LWR is to offset electricity loss to be incurred by the freeze of graphite-moderated reactors with a generating capacity of 50mw(e) and 200mw(e) each, which were near completion at the time of the adoption of the agreed framework.

Accordingly, the annual delivery of 500,000 mts of HFO can not offset 2,000mw(e) loss caused by the freeze of construction of our atomic power plants scheduled to be completed by the year 2003.

At the DPRK-U.S. talks held in New York in March 2000, we laid out our proposal on compensation for electricity loss resulting from the delay in the LWR project.

We made clear that the compensation for electricity loss should be made by electricity and that other member countries of KEDO could contribute to this effort if the U.S. is in a real difficult position to make that compensation.

We also proposed to get down to working discussion with the party concerned once an agreement is reached in principle between the DPRK and the U.S.

The U.S. can not escape from its responsibility to compensate for the electricity loss to be incurred by the delay in the LWR project in any case.

If one side fails to meet its obligation, it should compensate for the loss resulting from non-compliance to other side.

It is the acknowledged norm and being practiced among the countries and is not subject to any alteration with the change in power.

Despite all this, officials in the new U.S. administration voice higher about the revision of the framework and supplying of thermal power plants, while making no response to our demand for electricity.

We can only interpret the U.S. claim for the revision of the framework as an attempt to evade its responsibility for the delay in the LWR project and an indication of its intention to lead it to its breakdown, given that the central point in the framework is the DPRK nuclear freeze versus the U.S. LWR supply.

Under the circumstances where the LWR project has been delayed by far, a serious issue is presented as to whether the U.S. is going to make due compensation for the electricity loss caused by the freeze of graphite-moderated reactors by the year 2003 or skip it over without making compensation.

If the U.S. goes without compensation, it would possibly create the situation where we have to resume the operation of the graphite-moderated reactor.

In the light of the sentiments of our army and people, we can not allow the U.S. to go without any compensation to us on any account.

If the U.S. side fails to meet its obligation to the provision of LWR project and tries to evade its responsibility to make due compensation for our electricity loss, it will only compel us to go our own way.